

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated December 21, 2004 requires Applicant to elect one of three identified groups of claims (i.e., Groups I, II or III). The Applicant hereby elects Group I, which includes claims 1-30 and 48-51. However, this election is made with traverse for the following reasons.

M.P.E.P. § 803 states that an application may be properly restricted to one or more claimed inventions only if (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed, and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. Thus, even if appropriate reasons exist for requiring restriction, such a requirement should not be made unless there is an undue burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims in a single application. It would seem that the searches involved for all three claim groups would substantially overlap. For example, the Office Action states (on page 2 of the Office Action) that invention I (claims 1-30 and 48-51) “lacks a business logic module . . . .” The Examiner here is presumably asserting that the claims that make up invention I do not recite the business logic of claim 31 (of invention II). However, for instance, a comparison of the subject matter of claim 9 (of invention I) with the subject matter of claim 31 (of invention II) indicates that related features are recited. This is merely one example that supports the general conclusion that the searches involved for all three claim groups would substantially overlap, thus making restriction improper under M.P.E.P. § 803.

For at least the above-identified reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests removal of the Restriction Requirement and examination of all of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-57.

The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned if any issues remain unresolved by this Response.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: January 20, 2005

By:

Peri M. Chung

David M. Huntley

Reg. No. 40,309

(509) 324-9256